

REMARKS

Applicants thank Examiner for acknowledging receipt of foreign priority document, Japanese Application No. JP2000-175573, that has been submitted pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 119.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of Examiner's rejection of claims 1 - 16 under 35 U.S.C §102(b). Examiner has rejected these claims in view of the cited prior art patent of *Paulick et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,710,987). The *Paulick* reference is directed to integrating both a radiotelephone and a pager into a single portable unit (Column 1, lines 24 – 28). *Paulick*, however, fails to teach or suggest the use of an electro-magnetic wave absorbing element in order to reduce the amount of electromagnetic radiation that reaches the user. Rather, *Paulick* simply teaches the use of a page receiver antenna 212 (which Examiner incorrectly states is a 'wave-absorbing element) disposed outside of a shielded area 204 such that the page receiver antenna is contained within the housing 102, but is not shielded from receiving external wireless signals. *Paulick* accomplishes this by feeding an antenna connection 201/202 through the shielded portion 204 to a recessed portion 206 where the pager antenna can receive external wireless signals. The antenna is not a 'wave absorber,' but rather, is used to transmit and receive electro-magnetic signals.

Applicant's invention is directed to an electro-magnetic wave absorber disposed between an electro-magnetic wave source and the phone user to further reduce the amount of electro-magnetic energy reaching the user. As a result, any adverse health effects of such a

level of radiation reaching the user are significantly reduced. *Paulick* fails to teach or suggest an electro-magnetic wave absorber formed on a conductive case for surrounding and housing all or part of the signal processing circuit, and for reducing the amount of electro-magnetic waves reaching the phone user.

Furthermore, and counter to Examiner's assertion in the last Office Action, *Paulick* fails to teach a conductive case for surrounding and housing all or part of the signal processing circuit. The front housing 102 cited by the Examiner is not conductive, and the shielded portion 204 *faces* the signal processing circuit, but does not *surround* it.

Finally, and also counter to Examiner's assertion in the last Office Action, *Paulick* fails to teach a conductive layer formed on another surface of the electro-magnetic wave absorber and electrically connected to the conductive case. (Rear housing portion 104 is not a conductive layer).

Accordingly, and in light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request Examiner withdraw his 35 U.S.C. §102 rejection, and place these claims in condition for allowance.

Examiner's remaining references cited but not relied upon, considered either alone or in combination, also fail to teach applicant's currently claimed invention. In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims now stand in condition for allowance.

Appl. No. 09/876,411
Amdt. Dated February 15, 2005
Reply to Office Action of November 15, 2004

Date: _____

2/15/04

Respectfully submitted,



(Reg. #37,607)

Robert J. Depke
HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLC
131 S. Dearborn, 30th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60603
Tel: (312) 263-3600
Attorney for Applicant

Appl. No. 09/876,411
Amdt. Dated February 15, 2005
Reply to Office Action of November 15, 2004

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States
Postal Service as First Class Mail on 2/15/04 in an envelope addressed to:

**Mail Stop
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450**



Attorney for Applicants